



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE "NEMESIS" OF THE YOUNGER CRATINUS

BY EDWARD CAPPS

IN v. 521 of the *Birds* of Aristophanes Peithetaerus says :

Λάμπων δ' ὄμνυσ' ἔτι καὶ νυνὶ τὸν χῆν' ὅταν ἐξαπατᾷ τι.

The last part of the scholium on this passage reads :

ὅτι οὗτος χρησμολόγος· ἔζη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Ὀρνίθων διδασκαλίας, οὐχ, ὥς τινες, ἐτεθνήκει. πολλῶ γὰρ ὕστερον Κρατίνος ἐν τῇ Νεμέσει οἶδεν αὐτὸν ζῶντα, καὶ ταῦτα πολλῶ ὕστερον.¹

The language of Aristophanes inevitably leads to the conclusion that Lampon was still alive in 414. But this inference had evidently been combatted. The author of this note, however, is able to advance conclusive evidence, as he thinks, in favor of his contention. Considered simply as an argument, the logic of his answer is sound if the *Nemesis* was brought out at a date "considerably later" than the *Birds*. But we know, as the ancient commentators on Aristophanes, with their unusually full information about Cratinus, must have known,² that

¹ The note is given twice in V, with punctuation after *χρησμολόγος*, *ἐτεθνήκει*, and *ζῶντα* in the first case, after *διδασκαλίας* also in the second. The note is wanting altogether in R, the controversial part (οὐχ . . . πολλῶ ὕστερον) in M, and the phrase οὐχ ὥς τινες ἐτεθνήκει in Γ. The variations in G and in the Princesps are unimportant. The signature in E that contained this verse is lost.

I am greatly indebted to Professor John Williams White for the use of the final proofs of his Scholia on the *Aves* and to him and Professor A. Körte for suggestions.

² The starting point was Aristophanes' jesting allusion to his "death" in *Pax* 700 ff., which Anon. π. κωμ. II Kaib. and most modern writers have taken literally. But though we cannot conclude from this that he was dead in 421 (see Cobet, *Observ. crit.*, p. 87 f. and especially Müller-Strübing, *Jahrb. f. Phil.* CXLI (1890), p. 513 ff., on the "invasion of the Laconians"), yet it by no means follows that he lived long after 421, as Zielinski, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXIX (1884), p. 302, and Müller-Strübing contend. We need not doubt the essential accuracy of *Macrobioi* 25 (= Apollodorus; cf. Jacoby, *Apollodor's Chronik*, p. 35) μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἐτελεύτα (i. e. after the *Pytine*, 422), at the age of 97. But the most explicit evidence, overlooked by Müller-Strübing, is after all the picture of the aged Cratinus in Ar. *Eq.* 531 ff.—The scholia date three plays of Cratinus, *Eunidae* (ad *Eq.* 530), *Pytine* (ad *Eq.* 400), and *Panoptae* (ad *Nub.* 961).

Cratinus died soon after 422/1. If this were the only difficulty involved in the scholium, undoubtedly the simplest and most obvious solution would have been adopted from the beginning, *viz.* that, since there was a younger comic poet Cratinus, the reference to Lampon was in a play by him. But this solution has never even been suggested, for the *Nemesis* is once quoted by Plutarch in such a way that it must, to all appearances, have been brought out during the lifetime of Pericles. Accordingly, all modern scholars have not unreasonably rejected the statement of the scholiast as irreconcilable with an established fact.¹

To one who examines in a mass the didascalical material embodied in the scholia to Aristophanes this conclusion seems less acceptable. The ancient commentators on his plays were possessed of a very extensive fund of information as to the literary activity of the tragic and comic poets to whose works they had occasion to refer, and this information was derived ultimately from the best of all possible sources—the official records of the dramatic contests at Athens. The frequent references to the principal writers of antiquity who dealt with didascalical matters—and this term may properly include not only the exact date of the production of a particular play, but also the chronological relation of one play to another as shown in allusions or parodies, or the relation of a play to an historical event, such as the death of a poet—suffice to convince us that the best hand-books were drawn upon by those who had a part in the compilation of this vast body of invaluable commentary. The “Didascaliae,” with and without the name of Aristotle, Callimachus, Eratosthenes, Aristophanes, “Carystius,” Crates, and other collectors of such material, are often cited and their opposing views set against each other with convincing clearness.² We are not entitled to deal with this kind of information with so free a hand as in the case of

¹ The verdict of Meineke, *Hist. crit.*, p. 44, is thus expressed: quod falsissimum esse vel ex eo intelligitur, quod Nemesis fabula post Periclis obitum doceri vix potuit.

² See the Index to the scholia under these names. Ad *Nub.* 552 Eratosthenes shows that Callimachus is not justified in complaining of the Διδασκαλῖαι; Lycophron is corrected ad *Plut.* 1194 on the strength of the Didascaliae, cf. ad *Ran.* 146; ad *Av.* 348, 424, Asclepiades is corrected in the same manner, and other commentators ad *Vesp.* 1326. And all but the first of these cases involve simply a parody or the first use of a word. The scholia are also able to identify athletic victors at Olympia, Delphi, and the Panathenaea, evidently by the use of similar records going back to Aristotle and other compilers of such material.

certain other classes of comment, in which the ultimate sources were far from contemporary (e. g. prosopographical notes), or where, as in certain branches of antiquities (e. g. the theatre and its terminology, customs, etc.), changed conditions are necessarily reflected in the notes of different periods. A brief examination of the facts in this particular will convince one of the correctness of this point of view.

Something over 50 tragedies and comedies are dated either approximately or exactly in the scholia, omitting, of course, the hypotheses and the prolegomena. The exact dates are a little less than a third of the whole number. In a number of cases we possess other evidence by which these statements can be controlled, and yet in only four instances,¹ so far as I am aware, has the testimony of the scholia been seriously questioned or its authority rejected. One error is corrected in the comment on another play: ad *Nub.* 604 a parody of the *Hypsipyle* is detected, but ad *Ran.* 53, which came after the *Clouds* in order of comment, we are told that this play of Euripides was brought out not long before the *Frogs*. The note ad *Thesm.* 32 has been looked upon with suspicion; we are there told about Agathon, ἡρξάτο διδάσκειν τρισὶν πρὸ τούτων ἔτεσιν. This play can be assigned by a certain combination² to the year 412/11, but Agathon's well-known victory (ὅτε τῇ πρώτῃ τραγῳδίᾳ ἐνίκησεν, Plat. *Symp.* 183 a) was won at the Lenaea, in the archonship of Euphemus, 417/6 (Ath. 5, 217 a), or five years before the *Thesmophoriazusae*. The scholiast's statement, however, is in all probability, when rightly considered, not an error, as those have thought who have proposed to correct τρισὶν to πέντε.³ According to the usage of the chronographers ἡρξάτο διδάσκειν, as well as πρῶτον ἐνίκησε, always refers to the Dionysia and not to the Lenaea.⁴ We

¹ Not counting, of course, the misstatements of one commentator which are corrected by another by reference to didascalie data; cf. p. 62, n. 2.

² Schol. *Thesm.* 162 and 190.

³ Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* II, p. xxxiv, note γ. Rutherford's <δύο ἢ> τρισὶν does not help matters. Welcker, *Griech. Trag.*, p. 981, n. 3, thought it a lapse of memory on the part of the scholiast.

⁴ One who referred to the Διδασκαλῖαι would in most cases have found two different dates both for the first competition and for the first victory, one for each festival. A choice had to be made, and it was made in favor of the greater festival. For proof of the statement, which goes back to Clinton but which has not been given due recognition, cf. *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXI (1900), p. 41 and p. 61.

may therefore assume in this case that, while Agathon won his first Lenaeon victory in 416, his first competition at the Dionysia was in 414. In a third instance, the note in R is manifestly corrupt. Aristophanes, *Pax* 698, speaks of Sophocles as an old man, and the scholiast asks: μετὰ τὰ ζ' ἔτη βεβίωκεν· πῶς οὖν γέρων; The writer, of course, did not forget the date of Sophocles' death, but the numeral sign has become corrupt in transmission. Read with Bergk μετὰ ταῦτα ιζ' ἔτη βεβίωκεν. The fourth instance is the note ad *Av.* 521, which is the subject of the present discussion.

It will be conceded that this showing constitutes a very remarkable record for accuracy, and that we may well hesitate to impeach the direct and explicit testimony of the scholiast with reference to the *Nemesis*. We are at any rate bound to look for a possible explanation of the apparent misstatement—a unique instance of error of this particular kind in the whole body of comment, so far as we know. Unhappily our external means of control are slight and may prove insufficient to justify a positive conclusion. But we approach the question with a well-grounded predisposition in favor of the defendant and may not render a verdict against him so long as there is a reasonable doubt.

The *Nemesis* is referred to 16 times, always under the name of "Cratinus." Eratosthenes, the first writer to mention it, gives an outline of its plot. Athenaeus mentions it five times as authority for a word or usage, Pollux twice in the same way, the scholia to Theocritus, Stephanus of Byzantium, Herodian, and Priscian once each for a word, the scholia to Aristophanes three times, with reference twice to persons, once to a word,¹ and Plutarch once for an epithet of Pericles. The allusions to Lampon and to Pericles are the only citations which give any sort of indication of date; the other quotations are entirely indifferent in that regard. Plutarch and our scholiast are, therefore, our only direct witnesses as to the authorship of the play.

Three possible explanations on the side of the scholium suggest themselves. The text, in the first place, may be corrupt. Van Leeuwen, for example, assumes that a clause has dropped out after ἐπεθνήκει in which reference was made to the colonization of Thurii.² This event,

¹ Kock omits Schol. *Pax* 1244, which should be added to frag. 116.

² Ad *Av.* 521. The mention of Cratinus, he thinks, grammaticos Alexandrinos

and not the didascalia of the *Birds*, would then be taken as the point of departure for πολλῶ γάρ. But the scholiast, according to this view, would not be giving a proof of his assertion that Lampon was alive in 414. Further, there is no indication in any ms. of a lacuna in the note; the text seems sound and the argument, as an argument, complete. Nor is it possible, in the second place, by a change in punctuation to dispose of the causal clause, so essential to the argument, which causes all the difficulty. It should be noted, however, that the repetition of the phrase πολλῶ ὕστερον is striking. Those who read it twice give it the same function in both clauses, πολλῶ γάρ ὕστερον supplying the reason for the assertion ἔζη ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Ὀρνίθων διδασκαλίας. καὶ ταῦτα πολλῶ ὕστερον then becomes simply an emphatic, and useless, reiteration. This construction is necessary in the text of Γ, which omits the intervening clause οὐχ, ὥς τινες, ἐτεθνήκει. But in the full form of the note it is possible to differentiate the second πολλῶ ὕστερον from the first by construing πολλῶ γάρ ὕστερον with οὐχ ἐτεθνήκει = πολλῶ γάρ ὕστερον ἀπέθανεν. This seems to have been Meineke's¹ earlier view, which he later abandoned for Dindorf's text, which omits the clause καὶ ταῦτα πολλῶ ὕστερον. The proposed punctuation has the distinct advantage that it leaves the καὶ ταῦτα clause as an essential part of the argument.² But even so, we have made no progress toward the solution of the difficulty, for ταῦτα cannot mean "all this in the *Birds*."³ To prove his point that Lampon was not dead in 414 the writer must cite a play, in which he was mentioned as alive, at least as late as the *Birds*; otherwise his argument is left hanging in the air.

sapit. The lacuna he fills as follows: οὐχ, ὥς τινες, ἐτεθνήκει· ᾤκμαζε μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν πρὸ δλυμπιάδα καὶ τῆς εἰς Θούριον ἀποικίας ἐπὶ Πραξιτέλους αἴτιος ἐγένετο. ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτ' ἐπεβίω, > πολλῶ γάρ ὕστερον κτέ.

¹ *FCG* II, p. 85 (1839), and V, p. xxxvii (1857). Dindorf's edition of the scholia appeared in 1836. Meineke's interpretation of the main note was not modified by his punctuation, for he remarks *fallitur* and refers back to his previous discussion; cf. p. 62, n. 1.

² So Professor White in his edition, reading οὐχ, ὥς τινες, ἐτεθνήκει, πολλῶ γάρ ὕστερον· Κρατῖνος <οὐν> ἐν τῇ Νεμέσει κτέ.

³ A meaning which must be admitted ad *Nub.* 691, where, however, καὶ ταῦτα is followed by μὲν οὖν. Compare also, for this kind of criticism in the scholia, ad *Ran.* 146, where the language is very similar, and ad *Vesp.* 1326.

We shall have to find our explanation, consequently, not by manipulating the text¹ or departing from its obvious interpretation, but by facing the positive statement which the note contains.

In the third place, the elder and the younger Cratinus may each have written a comedy entitled *Nemesis*. While there is always likely to be confusion and uncertainty as to the distribution of titles between two poets of the same name, yet no especial tendency is noted for a son or grandson to follow his ancestor in the selection of titles and subjects. It is true that both Meineke and Kock assign a *Cheirones* to the elder and a *Cheiron* to the younger Cratinus, but their decision is open to grave suspicion. And Nicostratus wrote a *Plutus*, and the ancients were in doubt as to whether he or Philetaerus was the son of Aristophanes. But there seems to have been a second poet of the name,¹ and, besides, *Plutus* is not an unusual title, as is *Nemesis* (Archippus, Πλοῦτος, Cratinus, Πλοῦτοι). The younger Philemon did not, so far as we know, adopt any of his father's (or grandfather's) titles. Furthermore, all but two of the nine quotations from the *Nemesis* seem to belong to the same play, and these two are indifferent, so that, according to this hypothesis, we should have one verse certainly by the elder poet, one allusion certainly to the younger, all the other citations belonging either to the one or to the other. For these reasons it seems altogether unlikely, in the absence of allusions to two different plays of the name, that each Cratinus wrote a *Nemesis*.

Either, therefore, the scholiast is utterly wrong in his statement or the error is to be found in Plutarch. In *Vita Periclis* 3, Plutarch speaks of Pericles' unshapely head, which led the sculptors generally to represent him wearing a helmet. He then adds :

¹ Wilamowitz, *Observ. crit.*, p. 43, suggests an error in the title, and Müller-Strübing, *l. c.*, p. 534, actually proposes Σεριφλοῖς for Νεμέσει. But this is imputing to the scholiast precisely the kind of error he is least likely to have committed, considering the documentary character of his source. Zielinski's solution, a second exhibition of the *Nemesis*, is utterly untenable, as Müller-Strübing has demonstrated.

² *CIA* II, 977 g, and *Bull. corr. hell.* VII (1883), p. 107, the former in the last decade of the fourth century, the latter of the year 280; they are evidently the same. That the Delian Nicostratus was a comic poet, as I conjectured, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XXXI (1900), p. 123, has since been made certain by Mr. David Robinson, who last year examined the stone and easily made out the heading ποιηταὶ κωμωδιῶν. There may have been two Nicostrati, one of the Middle, the other of the New Comedy.

οἱ δ' Ἀττικοὶ ποιηταὶ σχινοκέφαλον αὐτὸν ἐκάλουν· τὴν γὰρ σκίλλαν
 ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ σχῖνον ὀνομάζουσι. τῶν δὲ κωμικῶν ὁ μὲν Κρατῖνος ἐν
 Χείρωσι

Στάσις δὲ (φησὶ) καὶ πρεσβυγενὴς Κρόνος ἀλλήλοισι μιγέντε
 μέγιστον τίκτετον τύραννον,

ὃν δὴ κεφαληγερέταν θεοὶ καλέουσιν. (M. II, 147; K. I, 86)
 καὶ πάλιν ἐν Νεμέσει·

μόλ', ὦ Ζεῦ ξένιε καὶ μακάριε (M. II, 85; K. I, 49)

Τηλεκλείδης δὲ . . . καθῆσθαί φησιν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει καρηβαροῦντα,
 ποτὲ δὲ

μόνον ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἑνδεκακλίνου θόρυβον πολὺν ἔξανατέλλειν. (M.
 II, 373; K. I, 220)

ὁ δ' Εὐπολὶς ἐν τοῖς Δήμοις . . .

ὅτι περ κεφάλαιον τῶν κάτωθεν ἤγαγες. (M. II, 458; K. I, 93)

Plutarch here unmistakably ascribes the verse in question to the elder Cratinus, the contemporary of Pericles. It can hardly be imagined that a poet of the generation after Pericles referred to him in this manner. There are, however, two chances of error to be reckoned with. There may be a mistake in the name of the play—possibly *Νεμέσει* is an error for *Νόμοις*, a well-authenticated play of the elder Cratinus. Wilamowitz has urged exactly the counterpart of this error, *Νόμοις* for *Νεμέσει*, in a quotation in Bekker's *Anecdota* (Kock, I, 52), and such errors are by no means uncommon. But on the whole it is simpler to assume another kind of confusion. It will be noted, in the first place, that there is a certain lack of concinnity in the way in which these quotations from the comic poets are introduced by Plutarch. He begins by saying that the Attic poets call him *σχινοκέφαλος*, and the next sentence is introduced *τῶν δὲ κωμικῶν ὁ δὲ Κρατῖνος*, as if he meant to give an illustration for the preceding statement. He gives, however, no such illustrations, but only jests involving the word "head." This is the more remarkable since the famous passage from the *Thraṭtae* of Cratinus was ready to hand—the one perfect illustration of his statement about the epithet *σχινοκέφαλος* and of the fact that the sculptors were wont to represent Pericles helmeted. This quotation is reserved for chap. 13, where the subject illustrated is simply Pericles' connection with the Odeion. In the second place, while the quotations from the

Cheirones of Cratinus, the *Demi* of Eupolis, and the play of Telecleides are witty and well deserve to be quoted with reference to Pericles' deformity, it would never have been suspected that the verse from the *Nemesis* made allusion to this subject had it not been quoted with that implication. As it is, it seems singularly inferior to the others, though perhaps we should not venture to call it pointless. No better proof of this fact is needed than the history of the text. The mss. give *μακάριε* and *κάριε*. Xylander (Venet. 1560-70) was satisfied with neither and proposed *μακροκάρηνε*, which supplies the point if it does not satisfy the metre (if it is iambic trimeter). Coraes and later editors take pains to explain the pun in *μακάριε* = *μα* + *κára*.¹ In recent times refuge has been taken in a gloss of Hesychius:² *Καραῖος Ζεὺς· παρὰ Βοιωτοῖς οὕτω προσαγορεύεται, ὥς μὲν τινὲς φασι, διὰ τὸ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι, ἀπὸ τοῦ κára*, which has led to the reading *Καραῖε*, adopted by Meineke³ and others. Kock, however, is dissatisfied with all these puns and proposes a double play, *κεράνιε* for *κεραύνιε*, which, as he thinks, would suggest at the same time *κára*. He very properly objects to the obscure Boeotian epithet of Zeus on the ground that it was very uncommon and likely not to be understood by the majority of the Athenian audience. The other epithet, *ξένιε*, has also caused not a little trouble. Zündel (Meineke, *CGF* V, p. xxxvi) thought it referred to Pericles' solicitude to have his own law restricting the privileges of citizenship repealed in favor of his own bastard sons, and this interpretation has been thought to fix the date of the *Nemesis* in the year 330. The suggestion of the French editor, Perrin, is equally ingenious, that the word carries a thrust at Pericles' hospitable attitude toward such

¹ The word which originally stood in the text, whether *μακάριε* or *κάριε* or *Καραῖε* or *κεράνιε*, sadly needed a gloss if it really was a joke on Pericles. See Sintenis' note on *μακάριε*, who doubts if the word admitted of such a pun. It is notable that Pollux, when cataloguing words referring to the head, mentions *καρηβαρικόν* with the name of Telecleides under the caption *τὰ κεφαλῆς νοσήματα* and under *τὰ ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ὀνόματα* the word *ἐχινοκέφαλος*, crediting it to Cratinus; but he does not register this word from the *Nemesis*.

² Cf. Photius: *Κάριος Ζεὺς· ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ καὶ Βοιωτίᾳ*. No illustration or explanation of the word is offered in Roscher's *Lexikon*.

³ Meineke finds a play on this epithet in the frag. adesp. Kock II, p. 54, *Ζεὺς Καπαῖος*; see *CGF* III, p. 58.

foreigners as Anaxagoras and Aspasia.¹ But Blass frankly admits that the allusion is obscure. Rather than resort to emendation, however, to make the supposed jest in *μακάριε* suit the context in which it is quoted, or to force intolerably the natural meaning of *ξένιε*, is it not easier to imagine that the verse was not intended originally to refer to Pericles at all?

It is not to be supposed that Plutarch drew from his own reading all his quotations from the comic poets of the period, any more than that on matters of chronology and institutions he himself looked up the documents, inscriptional and otherwise, which he quotes or refers to. For the latter he had such books as Craterus and Apollodorus; for the persons who were the butt of comic jests he had the hand-books of the Alexandrians *περὶ τῶν κωμωδουμένων* or *κωμωδούμενα*. From such a source he doubtless gathered the principal quotations in the *Vita Periclis*. It is noticeable that he does not always cite the title of the play from which a quotation is taken; the omission in the case of Telecleides in our passage is striking. The reason may be here that in his source-book the title was omitted, because in the Didascaliae the play was indicated simply by *κωμωδία*, as we know was done even in the case of plays brought out after 440,² or else this substitute for the title was in the source and Plutarch omitted it as meaningless. In any event, it is likely that the titles of plays would have been given by him had he himself gleaned the quotation from them. In the many allusions to Pericles by contemporary comic poets, the most striking epithets, which became his standing designations in later writers, were *Ὀλύμπιος* and *Ζεύς*. Now, Blass³ has shown that the passage (chap. 8; cf. *Cons. Apoll.* 118 e) in which Plutarch inquires into the origin of the

¹ Adopted by Holden in his edition.

² *IGSI*, No. 1097.

³ In the Siefert-Blass edition of the *Vita Periclis*, p. 63: "Aber es ist schwer zu glauben dass Plutarch diese Sammlungen aus der Komödie selber gemacht, da bei ihm sonst, von Aristophanes abgesehen, durchaus keine Kenntniss dieses Zweiges der Litteratur hervortritt, und da andere vor ihm, die Grammatiker nämlich, dies Feld schon gründlich nach allen Seiten durchforscht hatten." He then points out in detail the close dependence of Plutarch, in speaking of Aspasia, upon a scholium to the *Menexenus*, and, regarding Anaxagoras, upon a scholium to the *Alcibiades* and upon the comment of Didymus.

epithet "Olympian" is exactly in the manner of the scholiasts, and he demonstrates that in a number of passages in the *Vita Periclis* he uses the precise language of extant scholia to Plato and of Didymus as quoted by Hesychius. In view of this fact, so significant for the methods of Plutarch, and of his uncritical use of his sources in general, fully demonstrated by Sauppe¹ for this particular Life, what is more natural than that the verse beginning μόλ', ὦ Ζεῦ, vouched for as contemporary by the name of "Cratinus," who had called Pericles ὁ σχινοκέφαλος Ζεὺς in one play and "the son of Cronus" in another, both quoted in this Life, should have been erroneously classed with the other quotations illustrating the witticisms directed by the comic poets against Pericles? We are not in a position to determine whether Plutarch himself committed the mistake or his source. Considering the scanty literary apparatus which the former had at his disposal in the little Boeotian town, it is perhaps more probable that it is to be charged to him. The possibility of taking μακάριε or κάριε as a reference to the unshapely head assisted, undoubtedly, in the mistaken identification of the Ζεὺς ξένιος with the familiar Zeus-Pericles. Or, if the original read Καράιε, was the Boeotian biographer somewhat over-keen, as the modern interpreters have been, to credit the poet with a subtle allusion to the Boeotian god? And, finally, it is remarkable that, if the *Nemesis* was written entirely with a view to malign Pericles and Aspasia, as modern scholars have thought, neither Plutarch nor the eager Alexandrian collectors of satirical references to great men in the comic poets found no other passage from the play worth quoting in this connection.

It is not at all against this hypothesis that the *Nemesis* is never referred to as by the younger Cratinus. The ancients, in quoting from or in referring to the works of authors of the same name, not infrequently omit the designation which will enable the reader to determine which one is meant. A good illustration is furnished by the two Apollodori, one a Geloan, the other from Carystus. The former is cited five times

¹ "Die Quellen Plutarchs für das Leben des Perikles" (1867), *Ausg. Schr.*, p. 481 ff. On p. 505 he says about Plutarch's use of the comic poets: "Eigene Sammlungen gaben ihm die Stellen der Komiker . . . an die Hand." Blass's refutation of this view is convincing.

by his name and *ethnicon*, the latter twelve times, while 33 citations are given with simply "Apollodorus." And the same play is explicitly attributed to both. The modern collectors of fragments, whose business it is to decide conflicting claims of this sort, where possible, have been disposed to seize eagerly upon any bit of evidence which seems to give an indication, and, in default of this, to assign doubtful fragments and titles to the better known poet. Undoubtedly, the same confusion and source of possible error existed in antiquity, and a word or verse might easily come to be employed to illustrate a matter for which, on chronological grounds, it was inappropriate or erroneous. But we are generally not in a position to correct errors of this kind.

Let us glance at the remains of the younger Cratinus. Meineke and Kock assign eight plays to him without question. Six of these are explicitly cited as by ὁ νεώτερος Κρατῖνος, while two are judged to belong to the Middle Comedy by the nature of their contents. Both editors strongly suspect that a ninth, the *Busiris*, quoted only once and as by "Cratinus," was written by the younger, since the story of Heracles and Busiris was a favorite theme of the Middle Comedy (Antiphanes, Ehippus, Mnesimachus). One of the six plays regarded as certain is once cited as by "Cratinus" (*Pseudhybolimaeus*); as to a second, the *Cheiron*, Meineke remarks: nisi disertis verbis ὁ νεώτερος Κρατῖνος commemoratur, nemo sane dubitaret quin notissima Cratini maioris Χείρωνες inscripta laudaretur. Finally, a third play is not free from suspicion, the *Omphale*, because a scholium to Plato says that "Cratinus in the *Omphale* calls Aspasia τύραννος," and we know from Plutarch that "she was called by the comic poets Ὀμφάλη νέα." But the *Omphale* story is also of the nature of the Middle Comedy (Antiphanes), and so the two citations which mention "the younger Cratinus" have cast the deciding vote.¹

Just as modern critics have assigned too few plays to the younger Cratinus, so they have given too many to the older. Anon. π. κωμ. II Kaib. and Suidas agree in the statement that the plays of the elder were 21 in number, which no doubt means that only 21 were known to the Alexandrians. Whether he wrote only 21, or only so many were pre-

¹ See Meineke, *Hist. crit.*, p. 412.

served, it is most unlikely that a larger number should be known to a later age. In the case of no other comic poet, so far as can be determined, is it true that a larger number of well-authenticated titles are mentioned than the number of plays accredited to him by the Alexandrians. A few examples, mainly from the Old Comedy, will illustrate :

Pherecrates 18 Anon. II and Anon. III; 17 Suidas; 18 titles preserved, 4 of them doubtful.

Phrynichus 10 Anon. II; 10 Suidas; 10 titles preserved, 1 of them doubtful.

Eupolis 14 Anon. II; 17 Suidas; 19 titles preserved, 3 of them doubtful.¹

Aristophanes 44 Anon. II and Vita²; 44 Suidas; 44 titles preserved, 4 of them doubtful.

Theopompus 17 Anon. III; 24 Suidas; 20 titles preserved, 1 of them doubtful.

Strattis 17 Anon. III; 15 (titles) Suidas; 19 titles preserved, 3 of them doubtful.

Plato 28 Anon. III; 28 Suidas; 30 titles preserved, 2 of them doubtful.

Philemon³ 97 Anon II; 90 Suidas; 75 titles preserved, 11 of them doubtful.

When, therefore, we observe that Meineke and Kock give 26 titles to the elder Cratinus (25, omitting the *Busiris*; Meineke 24, omitting this and the *Dionysalexandrus*), we are further confirmed in the opinion that, if we possessed more explicit information than the unqualified name "Cratinus" concerning the plays not vouched for by didascalical evidence (seven) or by indisputable internal evidence (*ca.* eleven), at least four of the titles which Kock assigns without query to the elder poet would be transferred to the younger. Of course, without further evidence, such as the newly found hypothesis to the *Dionysalexandrus* may furnish, we may not hope ever to reach definitive conclusions concerning the majority of these plays. We should certainly feel, however, that the absence of the designation *ὁ νεώτερος* in the references to the *Nemesis*, for example, should not stand in the way of our acceptance of the statement of the scholiast to Aristophanes. And that is all we desire to learn at present from the above figures. We proceed now to the internal evidence on the *Nemesis*.

We chance to be unusually well informed as to the leading motive of the plot of the *Nemesis*. Eratosthenes, *Catast.* 25, relates, quoting

¹ Hence the *αδ'* in Anon. is probably an error for *αζ'*.

² Four of these attributed to Archippus in antiquity.

³ Following Dietze, *De Philemone comico*, Göttingen, 1901.

Κρατῖνος ὁ ποιητής¹ as his authority, that Zeus, enamoured of Nemesis and unable to approach her because of her many transformations, himself assumed the likeness of a swan and violated her at Rhamnus. Nemesis bore an egg which, as Hyginus adds, was brought to Sparta by Hermes and put in charge of Leda. From this egg Helen was hatched.² We have here a sketch of a mythological travesty such as became typical of the period of the Middle Comedy. For such burlesques of the legends of mythology the amours of Zeus in particular offered a rich field to the comic poets of this period. We possess no less than sixteen titles of plays of this type,³ four of which deal with the Leda story, and of these the other three are by fourth-century poets, Eubulus, Alexis, and Sophilus. It is a notable fact that Hermippus is the only one of the poets distinctively of the Old Comedy who employs any of these themes. After him come Plato, Archippus, Sannyrion, and Apollophanes, all of whom belong more to the Middle Comedy than to the Old; the rest of them are distinctively of the Middle Comedy. Certainly we may say that, but for the misleading allusion to the *Nemesis* in Plutarch, this play would by common consent have been confidently attributed to the younger Cratinus on the strength of the plot alone.

Five and possibly six of the fragments bear directly upon the plot as outlined by Eratosthenes. Not one of them lends any countenance to the interpretation which has found so much favor with modern commentators since Bergk,⁴ who saw in every mention of Zeus an allusion to Pericles, and an allusion to Aspasia in every reference to Nemesis. It is hard to see how, in a whole play devoted to a burlesque upon the familiar Leda myth, it would be possible for such an idea to be carried

¹ Κρατῖνος in MSS., Cratinus tragoediarum scriptor in Hyginus.

² For the full references in the mythographers to the story as told by Cratinus, see Meineke, *FCG* II, p. 81, and Kock, *CAF* I, p. 47.

³ **Alcmene**: *Amphitryon*, Archippus, Νῆξ μακρά, Plato; **Danaë**: *Danaë*, Sannyrion, Apollophanes; **Europe**: *Europe*, Plato, Eubulus, Hermippus; **Io**: *Io*, Plato, Sannyrion, Anaxilas; **Leda**: *Laconians* or *Leda*, Eubulus, *Tyndareus* or *Leda*, Sophilus, *Tyndareus*, Alexis; **Semele**: *Διονύσου γοῶν*, Polyzelus, Anaxandrides, *Semele* or *Dionysus*, Eubulus.

⁴ *Reliq. com. Att.*, p. 130. Zielinski rightly protests against this view; Müller-Strübing supports it, but ineffectually.

through. The egg, the sending of it to Sparta, the hatching of it by Leda (cf. fr. 108), the chick Helen — all these details properly belong to a mythological travesty, but surely not to a personal satire. And in a play on this theme, such as the younger Cratinus wrote, there would be many a conceivable situation into which the verse quoted by Plutarch could have been introduced. For example, Nemesis herself in her great distress, and utterly ignorant that it was Zeus himself who was her persecutor, may have uttered the pathetic appeal, "Blessed Zeus, protector of strangers," — a fine parody of the irony of the tragic poets.

This solution is not opposed in any way to what we know about Lampon. Thuc. 5, 19 and 24 shows that he was an important personage in 421. He was probably a young man when he went out to found Thurii in 444. The allusion in the *Birds* would be sufficient warrant for our believing that he was alive in 414. So far as our scholiast is concerned, he need not have lived a great while after this. That *πολλῷ ὕστερον*, in the language of the scholia, does not necessarily imply a long term of years is shown by the note ad *Nub.* 591, where the date of Aristophanes' allusion to the *Maricas* is said to be "considerably later" compared with the first edition of the *Clouds*. The first *Clouds* was brought out in 423/2, the revision was made perhaps as late as a year after the *Maricas*, which was brought out in 422/1. Lampon, therefore, need not have lived beyond *ca.* 410, so far as the language of the scholiast is concerned, and at that time he would probably have been not more than 65 years of age.¹

The only information which we have had about the time of the younger Cratinus is furnished by his allusion to Plato in the *Pseudhypobolimaeus* (K. II, p. 292), to the parasite Corydos (K., p. 291), and to the Pythagoreans in two plays, attributed to him because of this fact by Meineke (*Hist. crit.*, p. 411). The allusion to Lampon now enables us to fix his date somewhat more definitely; he must have begun to exhibit sometime before the end of the fifth century. The allusion to Plato would be appropriate to any period from the early part of the fourth century. We are now able to understand for the first time the title of one play referred to by Athenaeus as by "the younger Cratinus," viz.

¹ Professor Körte thinks that he has independent proof, as he kindly writes me, that Lampon survived the year 410.

the *Theramenes*. Meineke, *Hist. crit.*, p. 411, was in doubt as to what person of the name could have furnished the title to this play, thinking that chronological grounds were against the assumption that it was the famous "Cothurnus."¹ But we now see that the title may receive its obvious interpretation. The play was brought out before Theramenes' death in 404, some years later than the *Nemesis*. Since the elder Cratinus is said to have died about the year 421, at the age of 97, the chances are that the younger Cratinus was his grandson, as Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.* I, p. 591, thinks.

To summarize: The text of the scholium ad *Av.* 521 is sound. To assume a lacuna (van Leeuwen) does not relieve the difficulty. The absolute trustworthiness of the didascalic scholia is against the assumption of a mere error of statement (Meineke). The scholiast was protected, further, from an error of memory (Wilamowitz, Müller-Strübing) by his documentary sources. The suggestion of Σεριφίους for Νεμέσει (Müller-Strübing) is supported only by the vaguest conjectures as to the date of the former. Besides, any solution which rests upon the assumption that Cratinus was alive after 414 contradicts the didascalic notice concerning the *Pytine* as his last play and the testimony of Aristophanes to his extreme old age in 424. It is not likely that the older and the younger Cratinus each wrote a *Nemesis*. The error is probably in Plutarch's assignment of the play to the former. A possible cause of the error was Plutarch's method of gathering comic quotations for his biographies. Deceived by the name "Cratinus," he hastily identified with Pericles the Ζεὺς μακάριος of the quotation. The mythographers, who knew the *Nemesis* well, did not dream of Pericles and Aspasia under the masks of Zeus and Nemesis. The play was a mythological travesty, incapable of sustaining a satirical allegory such as Bergk imagined. Typical in plot of the Middle Comedy, it is to be assigned to the younger Cratinus. The omission of the epithet νεώτερος in references to this play, while it has served to perpetuate the error of Plutarch, is common enough in the case of homonymous poets. The younger Cratinus was active before the death of Theramenes; Lampon was alive at least as late as 410. The *Nemesis* may well have been brought out between 410 and 404.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 275, he suggests that the name "Theramenes" was taken to represent the type of the historical character, to ridicule "Atheniensium levitatem et inconstantiam."